IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION.
WRIT PETITION No.316 OF 1995.

Mrs. Vrinda Mukund Pande,
aged about 42 years,a residing
at Kamaladevi Housing Society
Behind Bus Depot at and Post
Karmala Pin 413203 District
Sholapur. ..**Petitioner.**

Versus.

1] Vidya Vikas Mandal,Karmala
At Karmala, District Sholapur
(Through: Its Secretary).

2] Yeshwantrao Chavan Mahavidyalaya
at Karmala District Sholapur
(Through:- Its Principal).

3] The Registrar, Shivaji
University, Kolhapur.

4] Ministry of Education, the
Government of Maharashtra,
Mantralaya,Bombay - 32.
Through: the Secretary
Higher and Technical Education
and Service, Planning Division.

5] The Administrative Officer
(Pune Region)
Higher Education (Grants)
Central Building, Pune 001.

.. ..**Respondents.**

Mr.K.Y. Mandlik, Advocate for the Petitioner.
None for Respondent Nos. 1 and 2.
Ms. V.S.Mhaispurkar, A.G.P.for Respdt
Nos.4 & 5.

CORAM:R.M.S.KHANDEPARKAR,J.
DATED:13TH NOVEMBER, 2006.

ORAL JUDGMENT.

1. Heard the learned Advocate for the

petitioner and the learned A.G.P.for respondent Nos. 4 and 5. Perused the records. The petitioner challenges judgment and order dated 11th November, 1994 passed by the College Tribunal, Pune in Appeal No. 34 of 1994.

2. Undisputedly, the appointment of the petitioner was on temporary basis as the post in which she was appointed meant for reserved category candidate and undisputedly petitioner does not belong to reserved category candidate. The approval granted for the appointment of the petitioner was also for the fixed term and taking into consideration the fact that the reserved category candidate was not available at the relevant time to fill the said post.

3. Since the appointment of the petitioner was made in the vacancy meant for reserved category candidate and the petitioner does not belong to the reserved category candidate, no grievance can be made by the petitioner that no permanent employment is being given to the petitioner in the said post. The management

was perfectly justfied in giving temporary appointment to the petitioner and considering the same, Tribunal has dismissed the appeal for which the Petitioner had made grievance about termination of her services and requested to give appointment on permanent basis in the said post.

4. For the reasons stated above,therefore, I do not find any justification for interference in the judgment and order of the Tribunal. No case is made out for interference and,therefore, the Petition fails and is dismissed. Rule is discharged with no order as to costs.

[R.M.S.KHANDEPARKAR,J]